

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE NEW ARMY AND ITS USE OF JOINT FIRES

by

Lieutenant Colonel Randall T. Barnes
United States Army

Colonel Charles Allen
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 15 MAR 2006		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE New Army and Its Use of Joint Fires				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Randall Barnes				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 22	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Randall T. Barnes
TITLE: The New Army and Its Use of Joint Fires
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 14 March 2006 WORD COUNT: 5434 PAGES: 22
KEY TERMS: Fires and Effects, Joint Fires Training, Joint Interdependence
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

There is much discussion about Joint Interdependence within the Department of Defense. The 2005 Army Strategic Planning Guidance stated that in order to reduce redundancies and gain efficiencies, the Services must become interdependent where each must rely on the other services for certain capabilities so the entire force can function with greater effectiveness. The Army has made the decision to reduce organic fire support assets to gain more relevant combat support forces so the capability to execute joint fires requires greater focus. This research project provides an analysis of employment of operational fires in the 21st century. This study will review the current strategic joint fires doctrine and capabilities to identify the need for change. Finally, it will provide recommendations of new avenues and steps the services can take to provide our Regional Combatant Commanders with effective joint fires.

THE NEW ARMY AND ITS USE OF JOINT FIRES

There is an ongoing discussion about joint interdependence within the Department of Defense and, specifically, the United States Army. The argument is that the Army achieved the ability to deconflict joint fires sometime in the 1990s and moved on to integrate total joint operations as recent as Operation Iraqi Freedom. The 2005 Army Strategic Planning Guidance (ASPG) goes further to say now, in order to reduce redundancies and gain efficiencies, the services must become interdependent. That is, each service must depend on the other services for certain tasks so the entire force can function at greater effectiveness.¹ The ASPG is the Army's strategy that represents the Army senior leadership's vision of how the institution will fulfill its mission to provide necessary forces and capabilities to the Combatant Commanders in support of the National Security and Defense Strategies.² The Army's ability to dominate any form of the traditional armed conflict is a necessary overmatch that we must retain.

The military's future force concepts call for decisive maneuver through simultaneously distributed operations, continuous operations at high operational tempo, and direct attack of key enemy capabilities and centers of gravity.³ A networked approach to operational fires, both lethal and nonlethal, and the integration of fires are necessary elements of this future concept. The entire force must achieve fully interoperable joint battle command and joint fire control systems. What is needed is a seamless interface between communications and computer networks. The key to effective and responsive fire support coordination is exploiting the opportunities of joint fires.⁴ The future force will be equipped with enhanced systems and capabilities that improve our current weapon systems and readiness. U.S. Armed Forces are expected to be full partners in joint initiatives to improve integration of necessary operational joint fires across the entire spectrum of conflict, in support of land force operations throughout the range of military operations from small scale counterinsurgency to strategic global strike.⁵ In essence, the Army, specifically the field artillery, must take joint interdependency seriously because our concept development, experimentation, and capabilities generation process will proceed along a joint path in the 21st century.

History

Reorganizing the military establishment of the United States has been a subject of considerable congressional interest throughout much of the 20th century. As early as 1921, Congress began considering proposals to combine or unify the military departments under a single executive agency. Between 1921 and 1945 Congress considered some 50 proposals to

reorganize the U.S. Armed Forces that resulted in the passing of the National Security Act of 1947. This was the last major reorganization of the armed forces until the year 1986.⁶

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense (DOD) Reorganization Act of 1986, informally called the Goldwater-Nichols Act (GNA), completely reorganized the United States military command structure. Under the GNA, military advice was centralized in the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staffs (CJCS) as opposed to the service chiefs. The GNA increased the ability of the CJCS to direct overall strategy, but provided greater command authority to Regional Combatant Commanders (RCC). The Chairman was designated as the principal military advisor to the President of the United States, National Security Council, and Secretary of Defense.⁷ His other tasks include:

- Developing doctrine for the joint employment of the armed forces.
- Performing net assessments to determine the capabilities of the armed forces.
- Formulating policies for joint training.
- Establishing and maintaining a uniform system of evaluating preparedness.⁸

The Department of Defense has made significant progress executing the intent of GNA.⁹ The real issue is whether all services use the law to prepare for the security challenges, threats, and missions which have arisen in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on United States. In the author's view, the answer is no—we are on the correct path, but more must be done.

The invasion of Panama (1989) and the Persian Gulf War (1990-91) were demonstrations of more effective joint operations following the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Actually, history shows that these wars were fought along assigned areas of operations and boundaries. All ground forces—the Marines, Army and Special Forces operated in their distinct sectors. Aviation from all four services was included, but they also operated in distinct sectors in support of their respective service. Moreover, the Air Force usually preferred attacking strategic theater targets in pursuit of specific objectives.¹⁰

Throughout the 20th and into the 21st century, great strides have been made in military technologies, organizations, and operational concepts that in time have caused the Army to rethink its Airland Battle Doctrine.¹¹ Lessons learned from a two-war front—Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom—combined with the present force level of troops (512,000; which includes the 30,000 increase) and equipment from which to draw capabilities from, suggest that the services must work together to produce a synergistic effect.¹² This is also true as the military continues to revolutionize the employment of theater level lethal and nonlethal fires.

A key factor to the success of future joint operations is joint fire support. Joint fire support links weapons effects to land, maritime, amphibious, and special operations forces movement, maneuver, and control of territory, populations, and key waters. The lethal and nonlethal effects from joint fire support must be integrated with the fire and maneuver of the supported force to achieve overwhelming results in combat power.¹³

Commanders and their staffs must synchronize operational joint fire support in time, space, and purpose to increase the total effectiveness of the joint force. The key to effective synchronization of joint fire support is thorough and continuous planning followed by aggressive coordination efforts and vigorous execution. Synchronized and integrated joint fire support links weapons effects to the joint force commander's campaign or operation objectives through component operations.¹⁴

Many challenges still exist in contemporary operations with coordinating close air support (CAS) for ground forces. Major General Franklin L. Hagenbeck, commander of the 10th Mountain Division and the on-scene commander for Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan, hinted that operational effectiveness was limited because close air support (particularly from the Air Force) was hindered by over reliance on precision-guided munitions, difficulty in hitting non-fixed targets, and strict targeting procedures.¹⁵ New systems for addressing the challenges of CAS are being put into place as the Army transitions into a more expeditionary force.

The Capstone Concept for Joint Operations

The Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO) articulates the way the future force will fight and operate across the full range of military operations in the 21st century. The CCJO is a collection of concepts in accordance with the strategic objectives that support the National Defense Strategy, Transformation Planning Guidance, National Security Strategy, and Strategic Planning Guidance, that guides the development of future joint forces capabilities.¹⁶ The CCJO is divided into three compatible subcomponents—the Joint Operating Concepts (JOCs) which focuses on major combat and stability operations, homeland security, and strategic deterrence; Joint Functional Concepts (JFCs) which focuses on force application, battlespace awareness, command and control, focused logistics, force protection, and net-centric operations; Joint Integrating Concepts (JICs) which focuses on global strikes, joint forcible entry operations, integrated air and missile defense, joint undersea superiority, and seabasing.¹⁷

The CCJO is a subjective assessment of the environmental and military situations that are expected between the years 2012-2025.¹⁸ Embedded into the CCJO are the Joint Operations and Operating Concepts.

The Joint Operations Concepts

The Joint Operations Concepts (JOpsC) is the overarching concept document that outlines the full spectrum dominance of the future force.¹⁹ The JOpsC describes the conduct of joint operations at strategic, operational and interagency context—it also sets the parameters for the development of joint capabilities within the JOC and JICs.²⁰ The JOpsC also defines the construct for operating, functional, and enabling concepts that will identify emerging capabilities across air, land, sea, and space.²¹ As the first critical stage of the new Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) process, the JOpsCs are translated into an operational capability level of detail to ensure that all concept developers have a mutual understanding among each other.²² There are some who do not agree with these new concepts as effective doctrine.

In a December 2005 email from LTG (Ret) Paul Van Riper expressed his opinion that the JCIDS concept has led to the creation of an excess of concepts, most of which are devoid of meaningful content.²³ He is concerned that as the future forces transforms, leaders within the officer corps will become overwhelmed with the additional joint concepts as they filter into the military professional education system.²⁴ To address the confusion LTG (Ret) Van Riper recommended that first, “senior joint and service leaders must clearly identify the most significant problems or opportunities—not more than one or two of each—presently confronting joint forces.”²⁵ He offered “two problems for consideration, insurgency and operational design and planning.”²⁶ Second, “with close involvement of these leaders, staffs need to assist in developing a clear understanding of each identified problem or opportunity.”²⁷ Third, “senior leaders through discourse with other experienced and professionally schooled officers must seek to find a remedy that will enable them to solve the problem or take advantage of the opportunity.”²⁸

Army concepts and capabilities must nest within the JOpsC and its unifying framework of subordinated concepts. The JOpsC elaborates on relationships within the family of concepts. This document allows the concept planners to consider the future environment and explore what key characteristics are needed for the military to operate.²⁹

The ability to sense, understand, decide, and act faster than any adversary in any situation will give our military the dominance it seeks. It also identifies the future joint attributes needed in order to achieve full spectrum dominance.³⁰ In this author’s opinion, in order to succeed in an uncertain, dynamic future security environment, the JOpsC must emphasize a capabilities based and adaptable force in order to balance key tasks and manage risks within a global perspective.³¹

As the core of the future CCJO, a tall task for the JOpsC will be to advocate a joint force that is capable of conducting rapidly executable simultaneous and sequential operations throughout a non-linear battlespace. This should include close coordination with interagency and multinational partners. It is of the author's opinion, that if trained properly, our future joint force will be able to rapidly build momentum and close the gaps between decisions, deployment, employment, and sustainment of forces. This will require the joint force to organize and train as capabilities-based force packages which are quickly tailored and scaled for a flexible array of capabilities across the range of military operations.

To succeed, the joint force must adopt a joint and expeditionary mindset, reflecting greater versatility and deployability, while ensuring the necessary capabilities to conduct both sustained combat and potentially simultaneous operations to reestablish stability. The key to success is to optimize our forces capabilities, organizations, and firepower assets. That way, the best is contributed within the joint capabilities to include methods required of each of the joint operating concepts within the CCJO.

Joint Operating Concepts

Joint Operating Concepts (JOCs) are the foundation of the CCJO because of their ability in influencing requirements for joint capabilities. The JOCs depict how the joint force will fight across the military spectrum—they are also intended to be specific enough to permit prioritization of transformation within DOD. The JOCs strive to build a force with specific characteristics: fully integrated, expeditionary, networked, decentralized, adaptable, decisive, and lethal.³² This method of planning fits well with the new Army doctrine of a capabilities-based force that is ready to deploy and can be plugged easily into a joint task force in order to win any fight.

Within the operational environment, joint forces must be designed, organized, and trained for responsive and successful execution of JOCs, and rapid transition between the mission sets, tasks, and conditions inherent in the JOCs. Joint Operating Concepts are vital in describing the details that are needed to conduct experimentation which allow decision makers to compare alternatives and make programmatic decisions.³³

The Department of Defense has approved four major JOCs that will provide future joint force commanders with a strategic objective through the conduct of operations within a military campaign: "major combat operations, stability operations, homeland security, and strategic deterrence."³⁴ An approval system is in place that requires the JCIDS process and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's validation.³⁵

- Major Combat Operations achieve objectives by removing an adversary's ability to conduct military operations.
- Stability Operations are military operations in concert with the other elements of national power.
- Homeland Security military mission sets are homeland defense, civil support and emergency preparedness.
- Strategic Deterrence encompasses the range of the Department of Defense efforts to discourage aggression by potential adversaries.³⁶

The JOCs guides future joint force planning will help clarify the conduct of joint operations across the Range of Military Operations (ROMO) in a multinational and interagency context. It provides critical links to other strategic guidance, it provides the key attributes of the future joint force, and it provides the conceptual framework for developing joint operating, joint functional and enabling concepts. It focuses the Department of Defense in exploiting available and emerging ideas and technologies to change the organization, planning, preparation and conduct of operations. Implementation of the JOCs will result in transformational changes to meet President Bush's challenge that, "Every dollar of defense spending must meet a single test: It must help us build the decisive power we will need to win the wars of the future."³⁷ The concepts presented in the CCJO provide direction to training jointly and improving doctrine for operational joint fire support in support of deep battle operations.

Why We Must Train Jointly

As the armed forces continue to experience success in both Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), there is an initiative of great promise in the concept of military joint interdependence. Several senior military officers agree that joint operations during Operation Desert Storm was the reason the U.S. forces achieved overwhelming success. The offensive air campaign phase integrated the Air Force, Navy, Marine, and Army airpower to strike critical Iraqi targets eventually leading to a successful offensive ground phase.³⁸ Moreover, a tiered planning concept of joint interdependence prior to OIF and OEF allowed the U.S. to deploy half as many ground troops and two-thirds the number of attack planes that it took during Desert Storm to accomplish a task that was just as difficult—destruction of Iraq's military forces.³⁹ Senior leaders are saying that improvement of joint interoperability is the reason why and that U.S. forces must depend on one another in order to achieve success on the battlefield.⁴⁰

In this author's opinion, interdependence of joint fires will be vital to mitigating risk and reducing reliance on operational fires in a joint expeditionary environment. Linked through effective joint command and control systems, the American soldier will potentially have the entire target acquisition and engagement resources of the theater at his fingertips. The Army's modularity transformation depends on enabling even our smallest combat formations to leverage joint fires through mechanisms such as the joint forward observers or joint effects control teams. To facilitate more effective employment of CAS in a non-contiguous battlespace, the military needs universal standards for observation, designation, and target acquisition.

The Air Force has demonstrated increasing responsiveness for recent operations and has committed to a general officer-led, Joint Force Air Component Command element at every Army Corps Exercise.⁴¹ The Army, like always, has concerns about responsive air support. On the other hand, the Air Force main concerns are control of the supporting aircrafts and the volumes of training request from the Army. Their resolution will require collaboration by both services.⁴²

The importance of joint training is particularly vital for the Army due to its dependency on other services for specific capabilities that are not organic in its inventory, especially fixed wing aircrafts that provide CAS and airlift. Presently, the Army and joint doctrine calls for the close integration of ground and air components in executing operational fires.

Title 10, U.S. Code, defines the Army's service responsibility to organize, train, and equip forces primary for ground combat.⁴³ Within the Continental United States (CONUS), the senior provider of trained and ready forces is the Commander, United States Forces Command (FORSCOM). As Commander of an Army Major Command (MACOM), General McNeill is responsible for the training of all CONUS-based soldiers. His present challenge is to support the Army Force Generation or ARFORGEN model—which was developed as part of the Army's transformation process and will restructure the forces from "a division-centric to a brigade combat team-centric system of force management."⁴⁴ Active, National Guard and Reserve forces will come in line with the ARFORGEN model. This aggressive plan allows all Army forces to obtain a high state of readiness if called upon to support any combatant commanders' requirements.⁴⁵

Each overseas unit is led by a senior Army commander in their region such as, the 8th Army Commander in South Korea and 7th Army Commander in Europe, and they share the same concern—support of the ARFORGEN model. The Regional Combatant Commanders such as the Commander, United States Central Command (USCENTCOM), have the responsibility for war planning and fighting but do not have tasking authority to the individual service organizations for training.⁴⁶ Any joint training is accomplished by cooperation among

individual commanders, rather than any higher commander having the authority to direct joint training across the services. Some argue that this arrangement is acceptable and the military does not need another training directive issued by a headquarters that is not in touch with units affected.⁴⁷

As intended by the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act of 1986, the Department of Defense wanted to bring the services in concurrence for future joint development in preparation for the 21st century. In 1993 the U.S. Atlantic Command (USACOM) was tasked with the mission of joint force provider, trainer, and integrator for all CONUS base forces.⁴⁸ USACOM's mission increased and it became the leading agency for joint warfighting and transformation for all U.S. forces, hence it was renamed the United States Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM). The Commander, USJFCOM reports to a Regional Component Commander (RCC) as the primary joint force provider.⁴⁹ Once USJFCOM receives a mission from one of the unified commands, USJFCOM has the responsibility to coordinate and supply the ready joint forces.⁵⁰ Moreover, in support of the Global War on Terrorism, USJFCOM was the first unified command to form a Joint Task Force (JTF) in support of domestic concerns (terrorist operations)—JTF Civil Support.⁵¹ As recent as fiscal year 2006, USJFCOM activated a new subordinate command—the Joint Fires Integration and Interoperability Team (JFIIT).⁵² This command will work to improve the entire process of joint fires integration across the services. They will also focus on providing methods to improve joint doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel, and facilities (DOTMLPF).⁵³

An important factor to the success of joint operations is joint fire support. Joint fire support links weapons effects to land, maritime, amphibious, and special operations forces movement, maneuver, and control of territory, populations, and key waters. The lethal and nonlethal effects from joint fire support are integrated with the fire and maneuver of the supported force to achieve synergistic results in combat power. Joint fires are usually executed within the boundaries of the land, maritime, or amphibious force. Moreover, joint fires are conducted in accordance with the priority, timing, and effects established by the supported combatant commander. Typically, joint fires have an immediate or near term effect on the conduct of friendly operations. The joint force and component commanders, with assistance of their staffs, must synchronize a variety of fires in the time, space, and purpose to increase the total effectiveness of the total joint force.

Joint Fires and Effects

The key to effective integration of joint fires is the thorough and continuous inclusion of fire support in the planning process and a vigorous execution of the plan with aggressive coordination efforts. Commanders should not rely on their fire support coordinators to plan and coordinate fire support solely from an operations order. A continuous dialogue between the commander and fire support planners and/or coordinators must occur.

Joint fires may come from organic or non-organic sources. The effects from all sources are maximized when executing preplanned joint fires. The complexity of joint fire operations requires detailed planning and coordination that culminates in precise execution at tactical, operational, and strategic levels. For example, a detailed operational fires plan can be very effective in shaping the battle by attacking targets deep inside enemy territory with airpower, and long-range artillery, such as the Army Tactical Missiles System (ATACMS).

When supporting a scheme of maneuver, the synchronization of joint fires is of primary importance in attaining success. Joint fires can be lethal and nonlethal weapons effects from any of the service components. In developing joint fires support plans, fire supporters must include four important fire support tasks:⁵⁴

- Support the concept of operation by setting the conditions for decisive operations by successfully attacking high priority targets.
- Support forces in contact and ensure freedom of maneuver to forces in contact.
- Synchronize fire support continuously and concurrently with the development of the scheme of maneuver.
- Sustain fire support operations and plans to reflect logistic limitations and to exploit logistic capabilities.⁵⁵

These are integral parts of a commander's concept of operations when putting together the joint fire support plan in order to set the conditions, in order to reach the ultimate goal of victory.

Joint Fires Training

The United States Army Field Artillery Training Center (USAFATC), located at Fort Sill, Oklahoma is responsible for training of all of the Army's fire supporters. As the military develops into a joint interdependent force, it is of the utmost importance that the new Joint Fires Observer (JFO) course is a success.

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Army, Air Force, Special Operations Forces and Navy identifying the requirements for training and certification was signed and approved November 1, 2005.⁵⁶ The MOA established a JFO Joint Mission Task List (JMTL) for services to develop initial and continuation JFO training programs. The MOA is the vehicle to increase the capability of these observers in the application of joint fires and effects. The training program emphasizes joint collaboration and the need for JFOs and Joint Terminal Attack Controllers (JTAC) to train together as resources allow. This new training is a path in the right direction.

The following Joint Mission Tasks have been identified for a JFO and will be instrumental in developing the training syllabus/programs of instruction for JFO certification and unit appraisal to maintain JFO qualification. They are divided into specific tasks with associated sub-tasks.⁵⁷

- Duty Area 01:
Engage Targets with Ground Surface-to-Surface Fires.
 - (1) Conduct adjusts fire missions.
 - (2) Conduct fire for effect missions.
 - (3) Conduct special missions.
 - (4) Conduct suppression of enemy air defenses.
- Duty Area 02:
Engage Targets with Naval Surface Fires.
 - (1) Conduct adjusts fire missions.
 - (2) Conduct fire for effect missions.
 - (3) Conduct special missions.
 - (4) Conduct suppression of enemy air defenses.
- Duty Area 03:
Engage Targets with Air to Ground Fires.
 - (1) Provide timely and accurate targeting data to a JTAC for Type 2 and 3 CAS terminal attack control.
 - (2) Assess basic effects of weather, terrain, and threat air defenses on CAS assets and advise JTAC.
 - (3) Apply the principles of CAS support weapons effects.
 - (4) Coordinate and direct close combat attack or support CAS terminal attack control with attack helicopters.
 - (5) Conduct an AC-130 call for fire.

- (6) Conduct terminal attack control as a non-qualified JTAC.
- (7) Determine requirement and transmit timely ABORT commands to controlling JTAC or aircraft.
- Duty Area 04:
 - Terminal Guidance Operations:
 - (1) Provide visual, voice or electronic targeting data for terminal guidance operations.
 - (2) Conduct laser guided weapon system terminal guidance.⁵⁸

The Field Artillery Center is also focusing on lessons learned from Operations Enduring and Iraqi Freedom in order to train the JFOs in the ability to call in fixed wing aircraft in support of combat missions. USAFATC is forecasting at least 500 graduates annually.⁵⁹

Upon graduation, the JFO will be one of the battlefield's greatest assets when it comes to joint fire support planning and execution. The JFO will obtain the enhanced abilities of assisting joint CAS execution. The JFOs will receive exceptional training and instructions in integrating surface fires with CAS (Types 2 and 3)—something that the original Army forward observers seldom received in depth at the Artillery Training Center. Without a doubt, this will increase the combat capability of the JTAC—the JFO will have the skills to provide accurate and appropriate targeting information when needed.⁶⁰

- Type 2 CAS: This type of control is used when the JTAC wants to control individual attacks but assesses that either the visual acquisition of the attacking aircraft or target at weapons release is not possible or when attacking aircraft are not in a position to acquire the mark or target before releasing or launching their weapons.
- Type 3 CAS: This type of control allows the JTACs to grant blanket weapons release clearance to aircraft or a flight of an aircraft.⁶¹

As the JFOs are trained in this new process, emphasis must be placed on the terminology to discuss joint fires and close and deep battlespace between the services. The inconsistency in service descriptions of joint fires and battlespaces makes joint fires coordination difficult. Crossboundary actions involving operational fires in depth and tactical fires in the close fights are important for planners. Joint fires with synchronized actions can provide greater economy of force and unity of effort. Joint doctrine should be modified to resolve this challenge.

Creating the new JFO course demonstrates that the Army is thinking ahead and very serious about working effectively with the other services. As the Army continues its transformation into a more flexible and lethal combat force, one of the determining factors of

success will be the Army's ability to leverage the full spectrum of joint fires for joint interdependency.

The Army has always taken advantage of technology in training its forces. As mentioned previously, the JFOs will be a major asset on the battlefield. An exceptional training platform has been developed to provide them with the needed training disciplines in a realistic, immersive environment.⁶² The Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System (JFETS), located at Fort Sill, Oklahoma provides for a suite of state-of-the art virtual training and concepts evaluation. Tasks within the JFETS focuses not only on the technical applications of a given skill base, but also the tactical and cognitive decision making processes involved in employing joint fires.⁶³

The JFETS will also provide the soldier with feedback on his selection and employment of a joint fires asset. The feedback includes potential, noncombatant casualties, fratricide and unintended collateral damage.⁶⁴ For example, the trainer will reward forward observers for using every means available to identify, locate and attack the enemy by employing the most appropriate sensors, delivery systems and munitions. The scenarios will have utility for current forces, including the Stryker brigades and new brigade combat teams, and future forces.⁶⁵

According to Colonel Gary Kinne, director of Fort Sill's Joint and Combined Integration Directorate, one of the most significant near-term challenges and concerns is the need to expand training from 200 to 500 students annually.⁶⁶ The system has one open terrain module, one urban terrain module, and more students than the school has modules in which to train them. Colonel Kinne stated that USAFATC has identified the challenge and is working towards a solution.⁶⁷ Also missing is a Type 1 CAS simulator that would give an observer that over-the-shoulder capability. Type 1 CAS requires an individual that can have appropriate command and control of the supporting aircrafts and proper assets on identifying the targets.⁶⁸

The solution is presently a concept—the Joint Fires and Effects Training and Simulation Center. A 177,000 square foot facility projected for the fiscal 2010 budget at a cost of approximately \$65 million, capable of supporting the training of more than 500 soldiers annually.⁶⁹ This futuristic center will eventually become the rallying point for all services' observers to be trained.⁷⁰

As new and maturing technologies emerge on diverse battlefields, the dominant task has become the need for a joint team to coordinate, integrate and train joint forces for maximum joint fires interoperability. This includes developing and fielding joint tactics, techniques and procedures and joint equipment.

The Joint Fires Integration and Interoperability Team (JFIIT), located at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, is a new subordinate command of USJFCOM with the responsibilities of linking

joint fires requirements with emerging technology and doctrine.⁷¹ JFIIT directs the training of the JFOs at Ft Sill, OK by establishing tactics, techniques and procedures. JFOs now have a better sense of specifically what is expected of them by field commanders.⁷² Being the lead agent for USJFCOM in the operational effectiveness of joint fires, there are 12 key tasks the JFIIT team focuses on:

- Joint Targeting
- Joint interdiction
- Joint Close Air Support (JCAS)
- Naval Surface Fire Support (NSFS)
- Surface-to-Surface Fire Support
- Joint Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses (J-SEAD)
- Non-Kinetic Means/Nonlethal Effects
- Command Control (C2)
- Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR)
- Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense (JTAMD)
- Offensive Counter Air (OCA)
- Combat Identification (CID)⁷³

The JFIIT is a new organization that has exploited success by improving DOTMLPF and joint fires integration across all the services. As the JFIIT continues to develop joint fires processes, integrate lessons learned into joint training, provide subject matter experts, and support the Combat Training Centers, it's a win-win situation for all services and the combatant commanders.⁷⁴

Recommendation

There are several options for improving joint fires tactical training ranging from redesigning the entire force as one joint military to maintaining the status quo. The author suggests that Congress make a change to the U.S. Code Title 10. The tactical Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force fire support elements should be directed to train with each other based on a regional alignment under the combatant commanders of the unified commands. Combatant commanders would direct multi-echelon joint fires training and issue training development guidance to the service commanders. Presently, the Army receives this guidance from the Commander, US Forces Command. Commanders of each of the aligned service component commands would then develop, resource, coordinate, and execute multi-echelon joint fires

training. This method fits well with the new Army doctrine of a capabilities-based force that is an expeditionary package with joint capabilities.

Another recommendation is that the Secretary of Defense charge the Commander, US Joint Forces Command with synchronizing assets to ensure that joint fires training is taking place. Fort Sill currently conducts an annual fire support conference each April. This conference is led by the Commander, USAFATC with most of the U.S. Army artillery brigade commanders in attendance and a small representation from USJFCOM. The author recommends a semi annual joint fires conference held at USJFCOM with all the service representatives in attendance. The objectives of the conference would be to work out all of the resource issues (i.e. aircrafts, training sites, host, funding...) and to confirm CAS coordination in support of operational plans and mission. A consequence of this conference could inevitably bring up other training opportunities that would benefit all the services and further reduce redundancies in capabilities across the military forces.

The services must add joint fire missions to their mission essential tasks list—the list should contain key joint fires tasks that offer high-payoff training. Without a doubt, CAS is one of those areas. The services should establish joint fires standards for aircrews, controllers, observers, companies, battalions, and brigades that require training in essential joint fires tasks.

Conclusion

The solution to joint interdependence rests in the heart of operational synchronization which, according to the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, is the essence of joint campaign planning and execution. Problems affecting both supporting and supported commanders exist. Military joint doctrine is being expanded to cope with future world challenges, but it's up to the services' senior leaders to abide by the foundation that has been established by the Department of Defense.

Endnotes

¹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Army Planning Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System*, Army Regulation 1-1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, January 2005), 3.

² Ibid.

³ U.S. Department of the Army, *The Army in Joint Operations*, TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-0 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 4 January 2005), iv.

⁴ Ibid., 1.

⁵ U.S. Department of Defense, *The Army Strategic Planning Guidance, FY 2005*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Security Strategy, 25 October 2004), 14-15.

⁶ Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr., *Unification of the United States Armed Forces: Implementing the 1986 Department of Defense Reorganization Act* (U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, Carlisle, PA, 1996), 2-4.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ *Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986*, Conference Report 99-824, 18.

⁹ James T. Locher III, "Taking Stock of Goldwater-Nichols," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Autumn 1996): 16.

¹⁰ Michael P. Noonan and Mark R. Lewis, "Conquering the Elements: Thoughts on Joint Force (Re) Organization," *Parameters* 18 (Autumn 2003): 33-34.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., 35.

¹³ Major General Michael D. Maples, "Fires in Operation Iraqi Freedom," *Field Artillery Journal* (May-June 2003): 1.

¹⁴ Lieutenant Colonel Robert J. D'Amico, "Joint Fires Coordination," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Spring 1999): 70-71.

¹⁵ Robert H. McElroy and Patrecia Slayden Hollis, "Afghanistan, Fire Support for Operation Anaconda: An Interview with Major General Franklin L. Hagenbeck," *The Field Artillery Journal* (September-October 2002): 8.

¹⁶ U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations*, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, August 2005). 1-2.

¹⁷ Ibid., 3.

¹⁸ Ibid., 1.

¹⁹ U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Operations Concepts*, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, November 2003). 3.

²⁰ Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3010.02A: *Joint Vision Implementation Master Plan (JIMP)*, (Washington D.C.: 2001). Enclosure A.

²¹ U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Operations Concepts*, 17.

²² Ibid., 17-18.

²³ Lieutenant General (Retired) Paul Van Riper, e-mail message to Generals Pace, Hagee and Schoomaker, 11 December 2005.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ U.S Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Operations Concepts*, 8.

³⁰ Ibid., 9.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., 18.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid., 18-19.

³⁵ Ibid., 19.

³⁶ Ibid., 18-19.

³⁷ Speech by President George W. Bush to the Citadel, 11 December 2001. *White House Website* (Cited September 2002). Available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov>.

³⁸ Colonel Christopher R. Paparone and Dr. James A. Crupi, "What is Joint Interdependence Anyway?," *Military Review* (July-August 2004): 39.

³⁹ Ibid., 41.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Lieutenant Colonel Robert J. D'Amico, "Joint Fires Coordination," *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Spring 1999): 72.

⁴² Ibid., 73.

⁴³ *U.S. Code*, title 10, subtitle b, part I, chapter 307, sec. 3062, (a).

⁴⁴ General Daniel K. McNeill, "Army Force Generation: U.S. Army Forces Command Future," *The Army Magazine of the Association of the United States Army* (October 2005): 66.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Charles Harrison, "How Joint Are We and Can We be Better?" *Joint Forces Quarterly*, Issue 38, (3rd Quarter 2005), pp. 14-15.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 16-17.

⁴⁸ *The U.S. Joint Forces Command Home Page*, available from <http://www.jfcom.mil/about/forceprov.html>; Internet; accessed 31 January 2006.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Joint Pub 3-09, *Doctrine for Joint Fire Support*, viii.

⁵⁵ Ibid., III-2.

⁵⁶ Lieutenant General James J. Lovelace, USA, Rear Admiral Joseph D. Kernan, USN Major General Norman R. Seip, USAF, "Joint Fires Observer," memorandum of agreement, Washington D.C. Memorandum of Agreement, November 2005.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 5-6.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Colonel William Greer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Field Artillery Training Center, telephone interview by author, 26 October 2005.

⁶⁰ Michael A. Logoria and D. Wayne Andrews, "Joint Fires Observer," *The Field Artillery Journal*, (September-October 2005): 31.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Scott R. Gourley, "JFIIT-The Joint Fires and Effects Training System," 15 March 2005; available from <http://www.military-training-technology.com/article.cfm?DocID=839>; Internet; accessed 3 December 2005.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Colonel Gary Kinne, e-mail message to author, 27 October 2005.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Daniel Jones, Donald Perry, Dale Ringler, Mark Jenner and Dennis Wise, "Joint Fires Integration and Interoperability Team," *The Field Artillery Journal* (July-August 2005): 36-37.

⁷² Ibid

⁷³ Ibid

⁷⁴ Ibid.